Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 26(f), Local Civil Rule 26-1, the Court's Scheduling Meeting of Counsel Order, and the Court's Scheduling and Case Management Order for Jury Trials, Plaintiff Michael Terpin ("Plaintiff" or "Mr. Terpin") and Defendant AT&T Mobility, LLC ("Defendant" or "AT&T") submit the following report of the conference that they conducted on October 19, 2020.

I. Matters Discussed Under Rule 26(f)

A. Rule 26(a) Disclosures.

By agreement, the parties already exchanged their respective Rule 26(a) disclosures on November 2, 2020, subject to the production of materials marked confidential which will be made upon entry by the Court of a stipulated protective order.

B. Subjects of Discovery.

The parties will conduct discovery on Plaintiff's claims in its Second Amended Complaint for (1) Declaratory Relief; (2) Unauthorized Disclosure of Customer Confidential Proprietary Information and Proprietary Network Information, Federal Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 206, 222; (3) Negligence; (4) Negligent Supervision and Training; (5) Negligent Hiring; and (6) Breach of Contract—AT&T Privacy Policy and in regard to Defendant's Affirmative Defenses as set forth in its Answer to the Second Amended Complaint.

The proposed discovery cut off, which complies with the Court's Scheduling and Case Management Order for Jury Trials ("Scheduling and Case Management Order"), is set forth below in Section IV. The parties do not propose that the discovery be conducted in phases or limited or focused to particular issues.

C. Changes to Limitations on Discovery.

Subject to each party's right to apply to the Court to grant further discovery in the event that the parties do not stipulate, the parties propose the following changes to the limitations on discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of this Court:

1. Each party is entitled to pose no more than 35 interrogatories to the other party.

Plaintiff contends that each party should be permitted to take 15 depositions. Defendant contends that the ordinary limit of 10 depositions is sufficient. The parties agree to further confer on the necessity of expanding the deposition limit as the case proceeds.

D. <u>Issues Regarding Disclosure, Discovery, or Preservation of Electronically Stored Information, Including the Form or Forms in which It Should Be Produced.</u>

The parties do not currently anticipate any issues regarding disclosure, discovery, or preservation of electronically stored information.

E. <u>Additional Orders</u>.

The parties will prepare and submit for the Court's approval a protective order governing the production of confidential information. AT&T prepared and circulated a draft of that protective order on November 20, 2020. The parties' proposals regarding the Court's Scheduling Order for this matter, including the date of the pretrial conference, are set forth below in Section IV.

II. Matters Discussed Under Local Rule 26-1

A. Complex Case

The parties do not believe that the Manual for Complex Litigation (current edition) should be utilized or that the procedures of the Manual shall be modified.

MACHIINGER LLP Century Park East, Suite 2600 Angeles, California 90067	
JEK L ast, Suit ornia 9	
Park Ea Calife	
MACHIINGER entury Park East, S Angeles, California	

В.	Motion	Schedule

See Section III(B), infra.

C. ADR

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The parties have agreed on ADR Procedure No. 3 (private dispute resolution proceeding).

D. Trial Estimate

12 Court days.

E. Additional Parties

At the current time, neither party contemplates adding other parties, but reserves the right to do so under applicable substantive and procedural law.

F. Expert Witnesses

As set forth in Section IV, *infra*, and based on the proposed trial date, the parties propose an expert discovery cut-off date of March 7, 2022 as per this Court's template for scheduling pretrial and trial dates. Pursuant to the Court's Scheduling and Case Management Order, affirmative experts shall be designated eight weeks prior to that date (i.e., January 10, 2022) and rebuttal experts five weeks prior to that date (i.e., January 31, 2022).

III. Additional Matters Discussed Pursuant to the Court's Order Regarding Scheduling Meeting of Counsel and Scheduling Conference.

A. Proposed Written Discovery

See Items I(B) and I(C), supra. Based on the proposed trial date, the parties propose a percipient/fact discovery cutoff of February 21, 2022. See Section IV, infra.

B. Proposed Law and Motion Matters.

Each party contemplates bringing a motion for summary judgment. Based on the proposed trial date (and taking into account the Court's requirement that thirtyfive days' notice be provided for motions for summary judgment) motions for summary judgment will be filed no later than March 14, 2022 (35 days before the

April 18, 2022 cutoff for hearing motions) and all other motions will be filed no later than March 21, 2022 (28 days before the April 18, 2022 cutoff for hearing motions), subject to the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court's Local Rules.

C. Settlement

The parties engaged in settlement discussions prior to the filing of this lawsuit. As earlier noted, the parties have agreed on ADR Procedure No. 3 (private dispute resolution proceeding). The parties believe further discussions would be appropriate after more discovery takes place.

D. Trial Length

The parties estimate that the trial will take 12 court days, not including jury selection.

E. Other Parties

The parties do not anticipate at this time that other parties will be added but reserve their right to bring a motion to add parties under applicable substantive and procedural law.

F. <u>Trial Type</u>

The trial will be a trial by jury.

G. Other Issues Affecting Status or Management of the Case

None.

H. <u>Proposals regarding Severance</u>, <u>Bifurcations or Other Ordering of Proof</u>.

None.

I. Short Synopsis of Principal Issues of the Case.

Plaintiff alleges that he was damaged by Defendant's conduct which led to a SIM swap of his phone and the loss of almost \$24 million in cryptocurrency. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant breached its obligations to maintain the privacy of his personal information under the Federal Communications Act and in violation of Defendant's promises in its privacy policy. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant was negligent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in not maintaining adequate security and in hiring personnel who either cooperated with the perpetrators of the SIM swap or were allowed by AT&T to bypass the security that AT&T had allegedly placed on its systems to protect its customers.

Defendant disputes Plaintiff's allegations and denies any liability to Plaintiff. Defendant argues that the criminal hackers who allegedly swapped Mr. Terpin's SIM card into a phone controlled by the hackers, and then used his SIM card to steal cryptocurrency, needed for multiple steps to be taken by various parties, including Plaintiff, to allegedly allow the SIM swap and resulting theft. Defendant argues that it does not control the acts of criminal hackers and that it at all times maintained reasonable security measures and disclosed to customers the limits of those security measures. Accordingly, Defendant argues that any alleged loss is due to factors other than Defendant and outside of Defendant's control, including the negligence or intentional misconduct of other actors or Plaintiff's own negligence.

J. Amendment of Pleadings

Defendant has brought three motions to dismiss in this matter. At issue in this matter are the six remaining claims of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint. See Section I(B), *supra*. The parties reserve their right to further amend the pleadings (and challenge any request to amend) under applicable substantive and procedural law consistent with the Court's rulings.

K. Resolution of Matters by Motion

The parties anticipate that they may each bring a motion for summary judgment on all or a portion of the claims of Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint. Because discovery has not been conducted in this matter, the parties are unable to provide further specificity regarding the potential motions at this time.

25

26

27

28

IV. Parties' Recommendations and Orders for Final Scheduling Orders

The parties respectfully submit the following recommendations regarding the final scheduling order to be entered by the Court based on the Court's template for Scheduling of Trial and Pre-Trial Dates.

Event	Date
Jury Trial	June 7, 2022, 9:00 a.m.
Estimated length 12 court days	
Last Date to File Final Trial Exhibit Stipulation	June 2, 2022
Hearings on Motions in Limine	May 31, 2022, 1:30 p.m.
Pretrial Conference; Deadline to File Motions	May 16, 2022
in Limine	
Deadline to File:	May 9, 2022
Proposed Pretrial Conference Order;	
Memoranda and Contentions of Fact and	
Law;	
• Joint Witness List;	
• Join Exhibit List and Exhibit Stipulation;	
Proposed Jury Instructions/Disputed Jury	
Instructions	
 Proposed Voir Dire Questions; 	
• Joint Statement of the Case;	
Joint Report re Settlement	
Last Date for Hearing Motions	April 18, 2022

Event	Date
Last Date to Conduct Settlement Conference	April 11, 2022
Expert Discovery Cutoff	March 7, 2022
Percipient/Fact Discovery Cutoff	February 21, 2022
Last Date to Hear Motions to Amend Pleadings or Add Parties	April 5, 2021

The dates proposed herein were determined and calculated based on the proposed trial date using the Court's template. In the event that the Court selects a different date, the parties would propose that all the dates be adjusted according to the Court's template.

DATED: December 28, 2020	GREENBERG GLUSKER FIELDS
,	CLAMAN & MACHTINGER LLP

By: /s/ Timothy J. Toohey
TIMOTHY J. TOOHEY (SBN 140117)
Attorneys for Plaintiff MICHAEL
TERPIN

DATED: December 28, 2020 GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER

By: /s/ Marcellus McRae

MARCELLUS MCRAE (SBN 140308)

Attorneys for Defendant AT&T

Mobility, LLC

24
25
26